DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 529 IR 006 101

AUTHOR	Roberts, Anne
TITLE	A Study of Ten SUNY Campuses Offering an Undergraduate Credit Course in Library Instruction.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Univ. Libraries.
SPONS AGENCY	Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 May 78
NOTE	81p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Analysis; *Credit Courses; *Librarians; *Library Instruction; Library Skills; Models; Questionnaires; *Research; Tables (Data); Undergraduate Study; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*State University of New York Albany

ABSTRACT

This study is a comparative analysis of undergraduate credit courses in library instruction, taught by university librarians and offered by ten State University of New York (SUNY) institutions--Albany, Brockport, Buffalo, Environmental Science and Forestry, New Paltz, Oneonta, Oswego, Plattsburgh, Stony Brook, and Upstate Medical. Topics include a brief outline of each institution; summaries of each of the credit courses, and the various teaching techniques being utilized; a prototype of a model course; and analysis of responses to interview questions by instruction, non-teaching public service, and technical services librarians; library directors; academic teaching faculty; and vice presidents. Major conclusions indicate that these courses are an integral part of the library and university program with positive support from administrators and faculty, and that the personality of the instruction librarian is an important factor both in the classroom and in gaining the support of other librarians. Data are presented in tables, and appendices include a bibliography and the questionnaires and interview questions used. (MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED157529

A Study of Ten SUNY Campuses Offering an Undergraduate Credit Course in Library Instruction

by

Anne Roberts
Associate Librarian
University Library
SUNY Albany
Albany, New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anne Roberts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A Council on Library Resources Fellowship Report

May 1, 1978

IR006101

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank: the Council on Library Resources for funding my project under its Fellowship Program; the State University of New York at Albany for granting me sabbatical leave, especially C. James Schmidt, Director and Dorothy E. Christiansen, Assistant Director; and my colleagues in the University Library for assuming my duties and responsibilities for six months, particularly Judith Place; my family, Warren, Erin, James, Thomas, Peter, for their support and encouragement and not minding that I took our only car for eight weeks; the librarians, administrators, faculty and students who were willing to be interviewed and shared their views with me, especially my instruction librarian contacts, Anne Mitchell, Chris Bulson, Lucille Brown, Jacquelyn Morris, Betsy Elkins, Evelyn Hoey, Mignon Adams, Mary Reichel, Joan Lippincott and Rhonda Courtney; a special thanks to Carol DeLisle for her typing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Methodology	4
Findings	7
Conclusion	55
Bibliography	58
Appendix	60

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Profiles of Credit Course on Ten SUNY Campuses	26
II	Profiles of Credit Course Content on Ten SUNY Campuses	27
III	Profiles of Instruction Librarians on Ten SUNY Campuses	28
IV	Responses of STudents to Course Evaluation Form	32
V	Responses of Instruction Librarians to Questionnaire	48
VI	Responses of Non-Teaching Public Services Librarians to Questionnaire	49
VII	Responses of Technical Services Librarians to Questionnaire	50
VIII	Responses of Library Directors to Questionnaire	51
IX	Responses of Academic Teaching Faculty to Questionnaire	52
X	Responses of Vice Presidents to Questionnaire	53
XI	Number of People Interviewed by Category	54

INTRODUCTION

After working full-time as a reference librarian for seven years, in the last four to develop and implement a library instruction program, including a credit course in library research skills, I was ready for a sabbatical leave, for both personal and professional reasons. I felt the definite need to get away from the daily routine of hours spent at the reference desk, giving course-related library instruction sessions, teaching the credit course, coordinating the the instruction program, plus dealing with all the interruptions that intrude in a large university library: committee meetings, special student and faculty needs in instruction, workshops and papers to be prepared and given, materials to be updated and printed, and all the other crises that seem to occur daily.

I long felt a need to sit back and think about what I had been doing in the way of library instruction, but had been so busy "doing" that there never seemed to be enough time to analyze my approaches or methods. Students and faculty alike responded well to me as an individual and a librarian, and my evaluations were good, so I continued along in my fashion. But I was bothered, as many of us are in the field, by all of the "skills" we were trying boldly to teach, in spite of the enormous amount of new information coming out in new forms. If I had the students learn how to use a Cathode Ray Tube terminal to call up circulating books, would there still be time to teach them how to use the Social Sciences Citation Index? How much would they remember after they had "learned" the tools? Should I concentrate on the complexities of libraries at the expense of trying to make libraries

easier for them to use? Was I fooling both my students and myself? Were my instincts always correct? I had always believed that students, or any users, should be comfortable in a library and should learn how to find their own way and their own information, since they best knew their own needs. The idea that librarians should find the information for users and present it to them had always been anathema to me; how, I wondered, can librarians know the nuances or subtleties of what the users want?

Coupled with these concerns was one I had often talked about with other instruction librarians: Does the personality of the librarian affect the course content? Can the personality of the instruction librarian overshadow the information being presented if the librarian is a performer, and teaching is indeed a performing art? Did some of us perhaps try too hard with our library instruction?

The six months sabbatical leave and the Fellowship Grant from the Council on Library Resources provided me the perfect opportunity for the personal and professional development I felt I needed. See Appendix A for my Proposed Program Statement. I took three months, from January to March of 1978 to travel around New York state examining ten of the SUNY units that offer the credit course for undergraduates in library research skills, studying the courses, digesting the information; I spent one month writing my report.

I had a number of questions that I wanted to address: Did the success of the course depend upon the personality of the instruction librarian?

Did the library administration and institutional administration actively support the course? Did the academic teaching faculty respond positively to librarians as teachers? Did the academic credit make the course more appealing? How did other librarians feel about the course and the teaching role of the library? How was the course structured administratively? Did all of the courses include the same elements, and could a prototype or generalizable model be used, or were the individual campuses and their students so varied as to make this difficult? Was the credit course a high priority for the library and the institution, or would it be the first item to go in a budget cut? Did technical services librarians teach the course? Have instruction librarians received reward or recognition for their efforts? Were other credit courses being developed, either in special subject areas or for users with particular needs or problems? See Appendix D for my interview questions.

Originally I had identified twelve institutions through the New York Library Instruction Clearinghouse Directory that offered the course, but one, SUNY Binghamton, had dropped it because the librarian who taught it was on sabbatical, and the other two, SUC Cortland and SUC Purchase had never offered the course. In order not to drop below ten, I added my own institution, SUNY Albany, to the list to make ten. I began to work on my project in the summer of 1977 to get some preliminary information from the libraries I planned to visit. I sent questionnaires asking for the details of the course (how long it had been offered, how graded, how many students involved, how many librarians teaching), and asking for some biographical information about the librarians teaching the course (age, sex, teaching and library experience, hobbies, professional involvement). For samples, see Appendix B. I next set up a visitation schedule after determining what dates and days would be appropriate. At the same time I collected as many of the course outlines and materials as I could from the institutions so that I would have an idea of how the course was organized before I arrived. I added another question to my list, that of teaching styles or techniques. Could I develop a performance checklist for teaching styles and would there be an array of styles depending on the personality of the librarian, or do we all teach alike? For my checklist, consult Appendix E; for institutions visited and dates, see Appendix F.

I spent eight weeks from mid January to early March travelling throughout New York state interviewing librarians, administrators and faculty about the credit course in library instruction, and sitting in on the

actual classes of the course. I had originally planned on interviewing students, but a blizzard during my first visit cancelled classes, so I decided to administer a standard evaluation form at the end of the courses so that my measurement tool would be consistent. See Appendix G.

I knew from previous experiences that instruction librarians were apt to be outgoing, and friendly, but I was unprepared for the warm and generous reception I received wherever I went. Another unexpected pleasure was the openness and willingness of people to talk about libraries, and especially library instruction. I had allowed 30 minutes for each librarian interview, and 60 minutes for each faculty, library director, and administrator interview. Often it was not long enough, as people wanted to talk longer, sometimes considerably so. I found that the grant gave me a certain amount of prestige and dignity, which made people take me seriously and answer my questions carefully and thoughtfully. Another unexpected side effect was that I was placed in a role, in effect, of doing consciousness-raising about library instruction, especially for the administrators outside of the library. Many administrators outside of the library had never thought much about library instruction; indeed, some did not even know that their library offered a credit course taught by librarians. Very often the question of academic status or the teaching role of librarians was mentioned as an integral part of library instruction. I felt they regarded library instruction in a new light after answering my questions. I also found myself in the powerful role of an outside observer; I could find out what certain key people thought or felt about certain issues pertaining

to library instruction, and other people on campus were curious to know what I found out. I felt bound to keep my findings confidential and I assured people of this before I interviewed them. In my role as observer I did try to convey my sense of the tone and the atmosphere of both the campus and the library to the library director before I left. I interviewed approximately twelve people on each campus: librarians teaching the course, librarians not teaching the course; administrators responsible for the course, including the library director and the academic vice president or dean; and academic teaching faculty.

One aspect of my study that I had not anticipated was how tiring it would be. When I scheduled my visits I had to fit them in during the time period the course was offered, usually at the beginning of the semester since most courses are offered then. I also had to allow for a Monday, Wednesday, Friday, or Tuesday, Thursday configuration. In addition, I had to plan the logistics of getting from one campus to another, and I also had to allow for unpredictable weather (I hit three blizzards which necessitated some rescheduling). I could easily have spent another day at each campus, and I did not allow enough time either on campus, or between visits to recover, rest, digest, and write. But, I found that my approach in using preliminary questionnaires, on-site interviews and observations and informal discussions worked very well for my study.

FINDINGS

As can be expected, many of my findings were predictable: the four year colleges differ from the university centers; there is great variation among the four year colleges and the university centers both in terms of curriculum, faculty and students, and social setting; instruction librarians teach many aspects of library skills similarly and yet there is a wide variation within the general subject, especially with sequence of topics and type of assignments, exercises or worksheets; instruction librarians display an array of teaching techniques and styles as various as their personalities; a model course is only desirable if it allows for wide individual variation within its framework.

But some of my findings were unexpected: the division between instruction librarians and other librarians was not as great as expected, and conflict or friction did not play as large a role in library instruction as anticipated; academic faculty and administrators were strongly supportive of library instruction and of librarians as teachers; the personalities of the instruction librarians play a more important role in the success of the credit course than the course content, but not in the way the study predicted.

Curriculum, population, and social setting.

Before embarking on my travels I made copies of the appropriate pages of the ten institutions I was visiting from *American Colleges and Universities*, and perused the college catalogs for each institution in order to get a feel for the campuses before I arrived. I had already visited several of the campuses two years earlier while looking at colleges with my daughter, but now I was looking at them in a new way and I wanted to have an overall view of the institutions.

Brief outline of the campuses.

SUC Plattsburgh is a coeducational state liberal arts and teachers college with graduate and undergraduate programs in the liberal arts, education, home economics and nursing. It, like many of the SUNY campuses, was originally a state teachers college. Enrollment figures show about 5,000 students, with faculty numbering about 300, and the library has close to 200,000 volumes. The college is set in the middle of town which has a population of 18,715, and Plattsburgh is 60 miles from Montreal and close to Burlington, Vermont. The Saranac River, Lake Champlain, and the Adirondack Mountains border the town, and the setting is picturesque.

SUNY Albany is a coeducational university offering the normal liberal arts undergraduate program with graduate programs in business, social welfare, political science, criminal justice, library science, education, and public affairs. It was a normal school and a teachers college before becoming one of the four SUNY university centers.

There are close to 15,000 students at Albany, some 800 faculty, and the library is approaching its millionth volume. The campus is on the old Albany Country Club grounds, with a dramatic white architectural modular complex of buildings designed by Edward Durell Stone. The capitol city offers many advantages for community involvement for the students; there is also easy access to Boston and New York City. Albany itself is bordered by the Hudson River and the Adirondack Mountains, and with Troy and Schenectady, makes up the Capital District.

SUC Oneonta, also a coeducational state college of liberal arts, has graduate programs in liberal arts, education, and historical conservation. Oneonta has about 6,000 students and close to 400 faculty; its library has about 300,000 volumes. The campus is situated on a hill above the town of Oneonta, which has a population of 16,030. Binghamton is the closest city and is 60 miles away. The surrounding countryside and proximity of Cooperstown provide an attractive setting.

SUC New Paltz is similar to Plattsburgh and Oneonta in that it also offers undergraduate and graduate programs in liberal arts and education as a coeducational state college. Perhaps it is best known for its program in fine arts. Students number about 8,000 (one fourth as part-time graduate students), and there are about 425 faculty members. The campus is 75 miles from Albany and New York City and is located on the edge of the charming small town of New Paltz which as a population of 6,058. The Catskills rise up to one side of the area and provide beautiful scenery.

SUNY ESF (Environmental Science and Forestry) is a coeducational state college which offers specialized degrees in biology, chemistry, ecology, environmental and resource management, landscape architecture, and forestry. Enrollment runs about 2,000 students, with faculty numbering about 125. The campus is tucked away immediately behind Syracuse University, and very close contacts are maintained between the two campuses. The library houses about 100,000 volumes. Syracuse is a major city and provides students with the amenities of metropolitan life.

SUNY Upstate Medical Center is just a short way down the hill from SUNY ESF. It is one of four SUNY medical centers and offers programs in physical therapy, medical technology and cytology, x-ray technology, radiation therapy, inhalation therapy, and nursing. Enrollment is just under 1,000 students and there are some 750 faculty members. The library with 100,000 volumes, is located within the center which houses a large teaching hospital and all that goes with it.

SUC Oswego, a coeducational state college like Plattsburgh, Oneonta, and New Paltz, offers undergraduate programs in liberal arts, education, industrial arts and technology, and vocational and technical education. Master's degree may be pursued in education and liberal arts. Oswego, like Albany, was a normal school and a teachers college, and it continues to have an extensive education program with laboratory schools and overseas exchanges. Some 500 faculty

teach 9,000 students. The campus is dramatically situated on Lake Ontario, and the scenery, especially during the winter months, is spectacular, with frozen ice constructions emerging from the lake's surface. The library has over 3000,000 volumes.

SUNY Buffalo is the largest of the four SUNY university centers, and offers programs to coeducational graduates and undergraduates through Faculties of Arts and Letters, Engineering and Applied Sciences, Health Sciences, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Social Sciences and Administration. Graduate degrees are offered in medicine, dentistry, law, health sciences, and medical technology. Buffalo was a private university before joining SUNY and the enrollments reflect that background; 3,000 faculty teach about 20,000 students throughout Buffalo's large system of faculties and schools. The library has well over one and a half million volumes. The campus is in a period of transition with a major move to the new Amherst campus imminent. The old campus houses the original university, plus some additional buildings which are used for the university's expansion. Proximity to Toronto as well as the city of Buffalo itself, provides students with cosmopolitan possibilities.

SUC Brockport has a Baptist origin as well as a normal school and state teachers college background. A liberal arts coeducational state college, it offers degrees for undergraduates and graduates in liberal arts, education, business administration, and nursing. Some 9,000 students attend Brockport, and a little over 500 faculty teach them.

The library holds about 300,000 volumes. The town of Brockport is small and quaint with a population of 7,878; Rochester is only 18 miles away and students go there frequently.

SUNY Stony Brook, the SUNY university center with the most Nobel Prize winners on its faculty, is coeducational and offers graduate and undergraduate degrees in arts and sciences, engineering, and health sciences. It is the newest of the campuses I visited, beginning as a college of science and engineering in 1957. The faculty numbers 650 and the students about 13,000. The library has about 800,000 volumes. The campus is located on the outskirts of Stony Brook on wide open land in new buildings. Port Jefferson and Setauket, along with Stony Brook, make up the tri-village area, and the picturesque atmosphere of the villages is in contrast to that of the modern campus. Although the campus is only 50 miles from New York City, neither the Long Island Expressway nor the train make it easily accessible.

Of the ten campuses I visited, five were state colleges, three were university centers, and two were specialized colleges. All have students who are mostly from New York state, a good many of them in all cases coming from the New York City-Long Island area.

The faculties at the state colleges appear to have close contacts with students and librarians because of the size and locations of their campuses. In most instances the college staff live in the town and therefore know each other as community members as well as academic colleagues. There is ample opportunity for individuals to work together

on college committees as well as on town activities. Generally, college librarians are highly regarded by students, faculty, and administrators.

At the university centers the collegial contacts do not seem to be as close as at the four year campuses: size and diversity of programs contribute to this. Opportunities for faculty contacts with students and other staff are available, but not to the degree that they are on the smaller campuses. Groups tend to be more isolated in their work as well as in their community life. Librarians have to make special outreach efforts to contact students, faculty, and administrators. Of the three groups, the students responded the most to the library instruction course at the university centers; often faculty and administrators had little knowledge of the library in the area of instruction.

The specialized colleges have an unusual situation as far as library instruction goes: the faculty and students are highly motivated and specialized and realize that they need library instruction for their work and research. The campuses are much smaller, so everyone knows everyone else. There are also fewer people to draw upon, especially in the case of the librarians, so people must work together for a successful program. Librarians, faculty, administrators, and students all seem to be unusually close and work well together in all matters, from curriculum changes to student social activities.

Brief summary of credit courses.

SUC Plattsburgh's library instruction course, Library Research in the Social Sciences, is taught by a librarian, but through the history

department. It runs for ten class sessions and uses for textbooks Daniel Gore's *Bibliography for Beginners* and Robert O'Brien's *Basic Guide to Research Sources*. The course stresses the library as a series of information networks and covers the LC scheme, subject headings, the author/title and subject catalog, filing rules, citations, reference books and bibliographies, indexes and abstracts, government documents, microforms, computer searches, and interlibrary loans. The final project includes a bibliographical essay, a bibliography, and a class presentation of any problems encountered. The course uses exercises and the usual in-house handouts which include: definitions of terms, a guide to the building, and a guide to bibliographic citations. The head of Reader Services is responsible for the course and chooses the instruction librarian carefully. A history faculty member usually consults with the instruction librarian and sits in on the class as well.

SUNY Albany uses Kate Turabian's *Manual for the Writers of Term Papers, Theses, Dissertations* in Library Research. This course also runs for ten one and a half hour sessions, although the evening section runs for three hours and covers two sessions together at once. The course stresses a basic understanding of the library and efficient use of one's time to do effective library research. The course includes orientation to the library, the LC classification scheme, the card catalog, subject headings, inter-library loan, reference tools, periodical indexes and abstracts, government documents, information retrieval (computerized searching), the search strategy process, and compiling and annotating bibliographies. The course requires completed worksheets and a final fifteen item

bibliography is also necessary to pass the course. In-house pastel-colored handouts include a self-guided-tour, bibliographies on reference books, indexes and abstracts, and information sheets on how to read a call number, interpret a catalog card, find a periodical article, and outline a search strategy. Five slide/tapes covering an introduction to the library, the card catalog, government documents, information retrieval, and the search strategy process are also used. Two librarians from the library instruction unit within the Reference and Collection Development Services department teach the course as part of their regular responsibilities. The course is listed in the catalog of courses under the School of Library and Information Sciences, since the library is not able to list courses.

SUC Oneonta offers two courses, Basic Library Skills and Library Resources and Research. In the second course, students have the basic instruction and then study two subject fields from humanities, social sciences, sciences, or education. Both courses include: the card catalog, subject headings, reference resources, (including reference books and indexes and abstracts) the information file, audio/visual materials, government documents, periodicals, microforms, and interlibrary loan. Both courses are offered for ten sessions three times consecutively each semester. Worksheets and a final bibliography are required. No text is required, and in-house handouts and brightly colored printed guides are used. A course committee, composed of fifteen librarians administers the course, and the committee has members from all library departments on it. All librarians are encouraged to teach, and nine librarians are currently

teaching several sections of both courses.

SUC New Paltz also offers two five week courses, ten sessions each: Basic Library Use and Library Resources and Research. Both are quite similar to the ones at Oneonta except that students may take the final exam or do a bibliography in the Library Resources and Research course. The basic library course covers the "basics"--tour, topic selection, card catalog, periodical indexes, encyclopedias, and a search strategy. Exams and quizzes are used instead of worksheets, and the class is taught in a regular classroom using lots of transparencies rather than in the library. Both courses are taught through the college's Innovative Studies program, (as are Oneonta's) and any librarian is encouraged to teach.

SUNY ESF (Environmental Sciences and Forestry) and SUNY Upstate Medical are the two specialized institutions in this study. Both attract students who have already specialized to some degree and are required to do library research in several courses as part of the curriculum.

SUNY ESF uses a textbook written by its own instructors, Jackie Morris and Betsy Elkins, *Searching the Literature of the Environmental Sciences: A Strategy*. This book is the forerunner of many of the academic undergraduate credit course textbooks in library instruction, and at least one other campus uses it as required reserve reading for its course (SUC Oswego). The course at SUNY ESF, Library Research Methods, has become so necessary to students and faculty alike that it is being taught in two ways: three librarians teach in the conventional class room setting with

an eight week lecture/laboratory scheme; and two are teaching the course as tutorials, using the textbook and meeting with students individually or in small groups. Exercises, worksheets, and in-house handouts accompany the text which covers all the basics mentioned above plus specialized resources in each area of the environmental sciences. The library is primarily a teaching one, and the course is the library's highest priority, especially since many ESF faculty require their students to take it.

SUNY Upstate Medical offers required library research courses for the medical technology and cytotechnology students which include basic library skills and critical analyses of the scientific literature. Two in-house texts are used: *The Compleat Card Catalog: Author/Title Section, Subject Section;* and *Introduction to Scientific Writing.* Exercises are included in the text. The basics are covered, as well as evaluative sections on scientific writing. The library director works with the academic departments in planning the curriculum and scheduling for the courses.

SUC Oswego offers a full semester two credit course, Library Research Techniques, through the English department. The course stresses outlining an appropriate and efficient literature search strategy, manipulating the card catalog, and recommends two texts: Grant Morse's *Concise Guide to Library Research,* and Kate Turabian's *Manual for the Writers of Term Papers, Theses, Dissertations.* "Problems" (exercises), quizzes, and an essay final exam, as well as a final search project including a bibliography, scope note, and outline of the search strategy, are required. Lectures and laboratories are the teaching methods used during this eight week course. The pastel colors of SUNY are seen once again as in-house

handouts to accompany the classroom lectures. Although the course is offered through the English department, the library is autonomous in setting up the course. One librarian, coordinator for instruction, teaches the course.

SUNY Buffalo's course, Sources and Methods of Library Research, carries four credit hours and is a full semester course. The course covers literature searching, types and purposes of sources, major sources in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. A mid-term exam, final exam, and two "pathfinder" projects are required. In addition to the topics covered by most of the credit courses mentioned above, a separate section of SUNY Buffalo's course is devoted to maps and atlases. Jean Gates' *Guide to the Use of Books and Libraries* is the required text, and numerous required readings are on reserve as supplemental materials for the course. In addition to the exams and pathfinders (annotated guides to resources on a specific topic), exercises are also required. In-house handouts are used as needed to define terms, explain bibliographical styles, or give examples. The course is offered through Humanities and the Division of Undergraduate Education by the Undergraduate Library. The instruction librarian teaches the course alone and has the authority of its content.

SUC Brockport offers Introduction to Library Research through the Humanities division and the course stresses the search strategy, LC scheme, card catalog, subject headings, and choosing a research paper topic. The course employs worksheets, in-house handouts, quizzes, a final project, and students may audit the course and also take it on an independent study basis. The printed handouts are used as supplements to the lectures. Students also consult individually with the instruction

librarian about their final project.

Like Oswego and Buffalo, SUNY Stony Brook offers a full semester two credit course, Academic Research, through the Interdisciplinary division of the university. The course covers all the major topics and includes reference materials in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. In addition to worksheets for each session, a final fifty item bibliography, including scope note and description, annotations for half the items, and a summary of the search strategy followed, is required. Texts for the course are: Kate Turabian's *Student's Guide for Writing College Papers*, and Stony Brook's own text developed by the instruction librarians, Terry Hubbard (now at the University of Alaska), Rhonda Courtney, and Brenda Coven, *Academic Research*. In addition to the texts, worksheets for each session and nicely printed handouts are used in the course. See Tables I and II for an overview of the courses.

One of the major difficulties that all ten campuses seem to have is in the listing of the credit course in the campus course catalog. The library is not considered an academic-credit granting department, so it cannot list its courses. Usually the librarian must find a "home" for the course, either in an innovative or interdisciplinary program, or through an academic department. One library lists its course through the library school which is unsatisfactory since the course then gets confused with "library science" courses. For many students a library research course is lost to them by being buried in the catalog listing; they may shy away from it because it smacks of "relevancy" if it is listed as part of an innovative or interdisciplinary program, or is too subject

oriented if it is offered by the English or history departments. Many students (and advisors) simply don't read the course catalogs carefully enough in the first place, so that a course must be carefully designated as "library skills" or "academic research" to attract attention.

Another major difficulty is that of advertising the course. Generally, former students are the best public relations officers one could want; they find the course useful and helpful and so they tell their friends to take it. Most librarians do try to generate interest with publicity, but it has little effect. Quite often the timing is off, or the points for distribution are not adequate. One librarian mentioned that the academic dean would not allow flyers or posters to be used after the course was given once.

Another problem is the quality of the paper and printing used for the in-house handouts. Most courses use the familiar SUNY central stores pastel colors of pink, blue, yellow, and green to provide some interest and relief from white paper for the guides and information sheets that accompany the lectures. A few libraries are fortunate in having access to adequate printing facilities, but many do not, and often the quality of both the paper and the printing is poor.

The credit courses that I studied were all carefully planned and thought out. I found the caliber to be unusually high, and my perceptions were reinforced again and again by several academic faculty who said that they wished their own departmental faculty would exhibit the same quality

and attention to content in their courses that the librarians did in the courses on library research. My findings show that the credit courses in library instruction are probably as rigorous and academically sound as most courses, and possibly more so than many of the courses being taught on college and university campuses; the library instruction courses deserve to be listed in the course catalogs so they are separate and identifiable, and they warrant better quality paper and printing for the course materials.

Brief summary of teaching techniques.

The eight instruction librarians that I observed during my on-site visits displayed an array of teaching techniques and styles as various as their personalities, in spite of the fact that most of them were essentially teaching the same topics. Their individual personalities emerged during their teaching, but in all cases, they seemed aware of this and adjusted accordingly if they felt they should.

I was intrigued with my hypothesis that most instruction librarians are apt to be extroverts and interested in people as well as being active rather than passive personality types. My hypothesis was not borne out; I found that their personalities, as well as their interests, were more varied and diverse than I had anticipated. See Table III for instruction librarian profiles.

Some of the variables were predictable, however. Most of the instruction librarians are female, range in age from 30-39, have had 3-5 years of experience in library instruction, have social sciences or humanities as their educational background, are reference librarians, like sports,

cultural activities, gardening, cooking, sewing, and are members of professional organications.

In the following section I will describe eight different observations I made of librarians teaching. They are in random order, and include both male and female librarians.

During this observation, the instruction librarian was informal, choosing to sit in front of the rather large class, facing them at their own eye level. She encouraged interaction by maintaining good eye contact, interjecting "O.K.?" as a way of reaffirming her comments and asking for theirs. The class was relaxed, yet attentive. The students were interested and alert, tantalized by the little bits of information given out by the librarian about the topic. An outline was followed, but each subject was prefaced by questions to get the students to respond. Facial and hand gestures were used effectively since the librarian was seated. She was enthusiastic about her topic, and conveyed this enthusiasm to the class.

The librarian I shall next describe was a bit more formal, deciding to stand solidly in front of the classroom in a more structured fashion. He used the blackboard effectively; went over statements and questions, and maintained a more formal distance as well as pose. The librarian asked and answered his own questions, yet maintained eye contact with the students; they were at ease, yet respected his presentation and listened to it carefully.

For this session the librarian sat on the table in front of the class in a

very relaxed manner. She was very comfortable with the class, and they with her; she called them all by name (a very small class), and treated all of them with dignity and respect. She maintained good eye contact and touched the students frequently on their arms or shoulders.

The following librarian was dynamic and forceful in personality. The room arrangement was intimate--a few students and the librarian seated around a table. When the librarian wanted to make an important point, he stood up, which gave weight to his words. He looked at each student while talking, and ensured that they understood his message. He chose to use the lecture method in describing a rather complex subject rather than the dialogue approach.

This librarian was brisk, efficient, and began the class exactly on time. Although the tone and setting were formalized (classroom, blackboard, chairs fixed in rows), the interaction between the librarian and students was playful and relaxed. The librarian walked around a bit, made extensive use of his hands and eyes, and encouraged students to interrupt. He maintained a tension between playfulness and seriousness throughout the hour.

A relaxed atmosphere was immediately established as this librarian sat on the desk in front of the room, swinging her legs and drinking coffee (along with the rest of the students who also had their coffee cups). She maintained the large class interest with good eye contact and by telling them anecdotes about the materials. Her quiet manner was a complement to

the activities of the class; she combined the seriousness of the topic with a wry attitude that the students appreciated.

This librarian exhibited a quiet restrained warmth to the students which they in turn responded to with friendliness. She knew all the students by name, and raised questions as she went along, waiting for them to respond. She used the blackboard to illustrate the points she wanted to make. The informal setting was a seminar room with a large table around which everyone sat. The students were respectful and interested. The librarian used her hands and eyes to convey her earnestness.

The librarian on this occasion was on a first name basis with the students, and they with her. She used her hands and eyes expressively, choosing to stand in front of the class. She captured the interest of the students by telling them of the peculiarities of the materials they would be working on and with. I had a sense of an established peer relationship, with the students acknowledging that the librarian knew more than they, but that she was working with them and learning with them. She exhibited a very serious attitude toward her topic.

Physical activity best describes this librarian; she bustled around the room, using the blackboard, examining books on a table, talking all the while. Every so often she would turn and query the students. She exhibited energy and vitality and infused the class with this feeling. Little attempt was made to draw all the students into the discussion; the librarian was content with a few talkers. The students were aroused

to take an interest in the subject because of her classroom performance which she used dramatically to enliven the class.

As you can see from my descriptions, all eight librarians are well within the informal range in their teaching techniques and style. What came through in all of the observations was the commitment the librarians have for their subject and their concern that they teach this subject well. All of the instruction librarians are aware of changes and trends in the area of library instruction, and are continually striving to improve their courses. The open-ended questions on the Student Evaluation Form, Appendix G, often elicited positive comments from the students about the instruction librarian's personality and teaching style; the librarian's influence on the students was considerable in these areas. Phrases like "the librarian made special efforts to clarify points," "her personality made the subject interesting to me," "his intellectual grasp of the material and his ease in teaching it were noteworthy," and "he was very patient and understanding," appeared frequently, as did more general complimentary statements.

Names of Institutions	Name of Course	Graded Letter	Pass Fail	Student Enrollment per semester	Number of years course has been offered	Number of Librarians Teaching	Number of Academic Credits	Pre-test Post-test	Other Tests	Written Course Objectives	Evaluations Given
SUC Plattsburgh	Library Research in the Social Sciences	X		6	3	1	1	X	X		
SUNY Albany	Library Research		X	40	3	2	1	X		X	X
SUC Oneonta	Basic Library Skills and Library Resources and Research		X	70	2	9	1	X		X	X
SUC New Paltz	Basic Library Use and Library Resources and Research	X		25	2	5	1	X	X	X	X
SUNY ESF	Library Research Methods	X		125	5	3	1	X	X	X	X
SUNY Upstate Medical	Survey of Medical Literature & Introduction to Scientific Writing		X	10	8	3	1	X			
SUC Oswego	Library Research Techniques	X		35	2	1	2	X	X	X	X
SUNY Buffalo	Sources and Methods of Library Research	X		7	4	1	4	X	X	X	X
SUC Brockport	Introduction to Library Research	X		15	2	3	1	X	X	X	X
SUNY Stony Brook	Academic Research	X	X	40	2	2	2		X		

PROFILES OF CREDIT COURSE ON TEN SUNY CAMPUSES

TABLE I

Name of Institution	Textbook yes	Textbook no	Required optional	Course Syllabus	Worksheets or Exercises Required	Audio-Visual Materials Used: Slide/Tape	Audio-Visual Materials Used: Transparencies	Final Project or Bibliography Required	Final Exam
SUC Plattsburgh	X			X	X			X	
SUNY Albany	X			X	X	X		X	
SUC Oneonta		X		X	X	X	X	X	X
SUC New Paltz		X		X	X		X		X
SUNY ESF	X			X	X			X	
SUNY Upstate Medical	X			X	X				
SUC Oswego			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SUNY Buffalo	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
SUC Brockport		X		X	X	X	X	X	
SUNY Stony Brook	X			X	X			X	X

PROFILES OF CREDIT COURSE CONTENT ON TEN SUNY CAMPUSES

TABLE II

Sex:	Male	5	Female 25
Age:	Under 30	5	
	30-39	16	
	40-49	5	
	50-59	3	
	60-69	1	

Years of experience in library instruction:	
2 years or less	5
3-5 years	16
6-10 years	5
10-15 years	4

Educational background: (all have MLS degree)		
M.A. :	Social Sciences	13
	Humanitites	14
	Sciences	3
Other:(Credits beyond M.A.)		
	Social Sciences	5
	Humanities	5
	Sciences	0

Areas of specialization:	
Reference	16
Circulation	2
Cataloging	3
Administration	2
Archives	1
Library Instruction	10
Computerized Searching	4
Collection Development	4
Documents	1
Media	2

Interests and Hobbies:	
Cooking	5
Sports	10
Cultural	8
Sewing	5
Gardening	6

Membership in professional organizations:	
1-2	14
3-5	16

PROFILES OF INSTRUCTION LIBRARIANS ON TEN SUNY CAMPUSES

TABLE III

Prototype of model course.

As can be seen from my description in the Brief summary of credit courses, most of the library instruction credit courses contain similar elements (textbooks, readings, audiovisual materials, lectures, guides, worksheets, exercises, quizzes, exams, pre-tests, post-tests, bibliographies, projects), and cover familiar topics (physical orientation to the library building, introduction to library services, library classification systems--particularly the Library of Congress scheme, subject headings, the card catalog, reference materials, periodical indexes and abstracts, newspaper indexes, microforms, government documents, computerized data base searching, interlibrary loan and networking, the search strategy process and topic selection, bibliographic citations, annotations and compilations, evaluation of library research sources and techniques). The credit courses in library instruction that I studied are more similar than not; even the student evaluations are consistent. The comments and tabulations from the Student Evaluation Forms show that most students felt the course length and amount of information presented were satisfactory, and they liked the lectures and worksheets a good deal more than the slide/tapes or transparencies(some courses did not employ either of these). See Table IV.

Student comments demonstrate that they profited personally from sessions on subject headings, indexes and abstracts, and reference materials. Many wanted more depth in the coverage of reference materials and documents; government publications, legal sources, and computerized data bases were mentioned often as areas that students also wanted to know more about.

Nearly all the students liked the practical worksheets or exercises which forced them to use the sources and the search strategy approach to library research. Most students found the supplementary handout materials helpful and liked a basic fundamental textbook if one were used; many felt that any background of theoretical required reading was not as worthwhile as the practical information available.

The instruction librarians, by and large, liked the fact that the course is credit-bearing. They feel that this gives the course prestige academically and helps them in enhancing their credibility with the students and with other faculty. It also helps to bring the library into the teaching realm. Most agreed that having control over the course and seeing students progress in library research ability was essential as a check on their own teaching effectiveness. Many felt that teaching was, as an extension of the reference process, even more important than service at the reference desk, and that a course was more effective and efficient for user education than other types of library instruction. Class size was varied among the ten campuses, and instruction librarians either worried about spending too much time and energy for too few students or about coping with large numbers (three campuses had to turn away students from their credit courses). The instruction librarians all voiced concern about how to increase "hands on" experience in the library, especially with large classes. Programmed texts and self-paced workbooks were mentioned as possible avenues to follow in this area. Many of the instruction librarians felt that small group laboratory or workshop sessions are

essential for library instruction and should be included in a credit course, again a problem for large numbers of students.

In sum, the question that I had asked myself, "can a monolithic system like SUNY develop a prototype of a model course that all campuses could use?" has been partially answered as "yes", since most of the courses already offered resemble each other closely. I found that most of the instruction librarians borrowed from each other quite heavily and all read the same articles and viewed the same materials, so that the bulk of their information was from the same "pool". This practice is typical of instruction librarians on the national scene and of the field in general; the practitioners are the ones developing materials and share this information with each other. (I saw several of my own worksheets and information guides being used with a bit of adapting done for the "home" campus). What appears to be essential in order for a model course to be useful and desirable is that it be capable of being adapted to fit the local situation, taking into account such variables as student background and ability, academic curriculum, library staff, and administrative support.

Questions	too long	too short	just right	yes	no	not sure
was the course	20	24	206			
was the amount of information presented	20	38	192			
was the information presented clearly				206	10	34
was the lecture content useful				190	30	30
were the worksheets helpful				220	10	20
were the slide/tapes (transparencies) useful				18	32	8

RESPONSES OF STUDENTS TO
COURSE EVALUATION FORM
(sample of 250 out of 655)

TABLE IV

Analysis of interview questions.

In an attempt to impose some structure on my interview question data, I will describe the results of my interviews by summarizing the responses according to the following categories: instruction librarians, non-teaching public services librarians, technical services librarians, library directors, academic teaching faculty, and vice presidents. See Tables V through X for the numberical

response, and Table XI for the number of people interviewed by category; see Appendix D for interview questions.

Brief summary of the categories of interviewees.

Instruction Librarians.

The instruction librarians were strongly in agreement about the validity of offering the credit course in spite of fiscal constraints. Most of them felt that in times of cutbacks or financial difficulties the course was even more important as a way of teaching the public how to use the library, and in effect, this was a cost effective and efficient way of employing staff. Many commented that large group instruction is more beneficial than one to one reference instruction in terms of practicality; the credit course seemed to be economically sound for this reason. A few librarians with low enrollments disagreed and felt that the course was not cost effective because of the few number of students reached. They went on to stress the economic soundness of using the course as a training ground for staff development; librarians who teach the course profit enormously and become better librarians in doing reference work and course-related instruction. One librarian commented that students who worked in the library who had taken the course were much better workers than those who had not, and this was of financial benefit to the library. Several instruction librarians stressed the long range benefits of life-long independent learning that is inherent in teaching library skills through a credit course. One librarian commented "there are far better teachers on the shelves, and we can show users how to find them independently and efficiently".

Most instruction librarians were in agreement about offering courses in special subject areas and to special groups of students, but with some qualifications. They felt that often a subject approach was more relevant or meaningful to students at the upper division level with a declared major, but that a basic couse was essential to lay the ground work in acquiring library skills. Many librarians commented on how ill-prepared college students are in this area; the elementary and high schools do not seem to be giving library skills to students and many of them have little notion of how to use the library and its resources. Foreign students and the culturally disadvantaged were the two groups most frequently mentioned that the instruction librarians felt could especially benefit from courses designed to meet their needs. Other groups such as the physically handicapped or older returning students could be satisfied with special sessions rather than a special course, according to the instruction librarians.

I was expecting to find evidence of some conflict or resentment over the course, especially in the case of the instruction librarians, and I did. Those who felt there had been conflict or resentment said that these feelings had waned through time ("time heals all things" one librarian said), or by having the course become a regular activity that the library supported. It was also evident that having particular librarians designated for administering and teaching the course was essential in moderating these feelings. Several librarians felt that conflict or resentment was caused by personality differences. One librarian felt that conflict or

resentment was a good thing, and kept the situation in a healthy state of tension.

That instruction librarians are aware of student needs in the scheduling of classes was apparent in their willingness to see the course offered evenings or weekends if students wanted it at those times.

Most librarians felt the course was very important to the library, in their estimation, for the wrong reasons. The credit course was a prestigious activity for the library to be engaged in, and it was also viewed as an important public relations tool with students, academic faculty, and administrators. Several librarians believed that the course was important politically, especially to the library directors who used the course as an argument in defending academic status for librarians.

Instruction librarians were split on the subject of how much support or recognition they received for their efforts, but more in agreement on the topic of reward for their efforts. Most felt that the SUNY bureaucracy and structure made it difficult for librarians to be rewarded at all; many commented that their activities in library instruction had been important for them in their renewal, promotion, or continuing appointment procedures, however.

In the area of faculty interest in the credit course, most instruction librarians felt that the academic faculty had shown little interest in their endeavors; a few interested faculty exhibited a great deal of enthusiasm, but most faculty were more aware of course-related instruction

than the credit course. Conversely, most of the librarians believed that their teaching activities heightened their awareness of the concerns of the academic teaching faculty regarding course details, teaching performance, class preparation, and correcting papers and exams.

The instruction librarians were unanimous in having definite ideas about the types of students who should take the course: their choices ranged from "all students," "the interested ones," "bright intellectuals, " to "the ones who've never been in a library before," "the culturally disadvantaged," "the emotionally disadvantaged." Most felt that students looking for an easy course or easy credits should not take the course, and second semester seniors were singled out as those whose motives were questionable in taking the course.

On the question of involving technical services librarians in teaching the course, most instruction librarians thought this was a fine idea. On many campuses technical services librarians are already involved in reference services, library instruction, and in teaching the credit course. One or two believed that the "stereotype held true" and most technical services librarians were unsuited for teaching activities.

The last question I asked during my interviews was intended to be open-ended, allowing my interviewees to have a chance to share with me their observations about credit courses in library instruction. Most instruction librarians took this opportunity to reflect on the credit course as a mode of library instruction. Most instruction librarians felt quite positively about it. Some of their comments are: "The course is good

here for broad and intensive library instruction, but at other places you may do the same thing with course-related instruction." "I have doubts about course-related instruction; the faculty like it, but I'm not sure about the students. What can you do in an hour? That's why I like the credit course." "The course should be mandatory; it's good, it's important, but we're reaching too few students." "We have too much superstructure in our course; we need to allow for more practical hands-on experience." "There ought to be a way we can help ourselves more in teaching large numbers of students. We would like to use audiovisual materials more, but in a way that's appealing to students." "The credit course could get dreary and filled with educationese. Course-related instruction can involve more people and it increases faculty awareness of the library." "Standardized materials with video and programmed texts might be a way to proceed in the course." "We need to pay attention to the level of teaching and our teaching techniques." "We are not very philosophical about our teaching; we do it and try different approaches. I'm not sure about the validity of this method." "The credit course is a mixed blessing: lots of work, bargaining with students, agonizing over the grading of papers. I'm not sure it's worth it." "I wish the grade schools and high schools would do a better job so we wouldn't have to." "The benefits for the individual librarians involved are tremendous; they see other faculty teaching, they establish rapport with the students, and maintain close contacts with former students." "Librarians have a limited number of teaching techniques; we need to develop more."

Non-teaching Public Services Librarians.

The responses of the non-teaching public services librarians were quite similar to the instruction librarians, not surprisingly. The only questions where the differences were noticeable were the ones on courses in special subjects or for special types of students, and the one on teaching making the librarians more understanding about faculty concerns. Here the responses were more negative. See Table VI.

The comments of this group were also similar to those of the instruction librarians. They felt that the high reputation of the course showed the benefits of doing research, and this helped the image of the entire library in times of financial tightening. Most agreed too that it is more economically effective and efficient to teach large groups of students at once rather than individually at the reference desk. One librarian stressed the fact that as libraries become more complex, users might be deprived of access to information if they don't understand the basics; the difficult questions should be done by librarians, and user instruction will help free the librarians to tackle these hard questions. By utilizing staff well this would be financially helpful to the library in times of shrinking budgets for buying materials.

More of this group felt strongly about not offering courses in special areas or to special types of students; their reasons reflected a wider perspective on the place of the credit course within the context of the library. Many felt there were simply not enough librarians to go around and that the academic departments should be the instigators of subject-oriented library instruction. Most agreed that special sessions would be

adequate for groups of students with particular problems; special credit courses were too expensive in terms of staff time and expertise, and the special sessions should enable these students to enroll in the regular credit courses.

The reasons given by the non-teaching public services librarians for the amount of conflict or resentment over the course varied a bit from those of the instruction librarians. Here, most of the librarians felt that more resentment was engendered by the support staff who very often did the typing for the credit course materials and didn't like it when some of the instruction librarians professed to be working at home and not appearing at the library within the work day framework of hours adhered to by the non-professional library staff. The credit course also aroused hostility, it was felt, when it was seen as a particular librarian's pet project. When this happened the course got a lot of attention, the instruction librarians much praise, and other librarians had to do the work they felt the instruction librarians weren't doing because of the course. Many people in this group said they had initially been opposed to the course, but now they perceived its value and were strongly supportive of it. They also mentioned that they did not want to teach, and were grateful that others did. They stressed the importance of students being involved with librarians in the formal classroom situation as well as in the more informal reference desk experience. Scheduling difficulties and compensatory time seemed to be large problems and ones that created bad feelings about the course, but often these were resolved once the administration recognized the validity of the course and regularized it.

This recognition made it more acceptable for instruction librarians to schedule time for class preparations and student appointments. Several librarians felt that scheduling was still a problem and a limited number of people were doing many different things, and this created tensions for everyone. A few librarians from this group singled out the personality of the instruction librarian as the cause for conflict and resentment: "She goes too far; she throws herself into it to the detriment of other library work," "the instruction librarian has a messianic zeal and sense of mission that is driving the rest of us crazy," are two comments on this point.

The final comments I elicited from this group are interesting: "It's one of the most important things we do, but it's growing so and we can't stop it; it's like a snowball." "The teaching librarians should have a knowledge of teaching methodology and learning psychology." "All libraries should have a separate department for library instruction." "Teaching style is important; how to make boring information interesting." "It's too much work for most of them; they work overtime and it comes out of their hide." "We're using lots of staff time to hit a limited audience. The course should be offered consecutively several times a semester to maximize this staff effort." "This is a territory that might be claimed by the library schools, but they aren't doing it, so we must." "The course should be part of the required university curriculum." "Having a credit course in the regular schedule of classes puts the library on a par with departments on campus." "The course eliminates the stigma attached to library instruction." "Not all librarians are teachers, and those who don't teach shouldn't be descriminated against." "Librarians still teach too many details; we need

to convey the overall philosophy of librarianship to students." "Many instruction librarians have lost their zeal because the academic level of the students is so low; there are too many students for us to help effectively."

Technical Services Librarians.

This group exhibited similar answers to the questions as the non-teaching public services librarians. As a group, they were very supportive of credit courses in library instruction, and were anxious for those technical services librarians to teach who wanted to do so. By and large they were convinced that the credit course was one of the most important activities of the library. They were also very realistic on the question of academic status for librarians and recognized the potential for campus credibility and respect for librarians when they teach courses for credit. As one librarian put it, "instruction is a way to become a faculty member." Some believed that since librarians have bad reputations and images, teaching a credit course was a way to improve the attitudes that the campus holds towards librarians. A few felt that the course should be required of all students. There was little expression of resentment or hostility from this group, and few comments about the viability of the course. As a group they seemed more interested in seeing library instruction credit courses succeed than I had anticipated.

Library Directors.

The library directors produced an encouraging and, to my mind, sympathetic understanding of the problem of library instruction credit courses in their

institutions. All but one were adamant in their support of the credit course, even in times of fiscal constraints; the library director not completely supportive was "not sure" because he saw it as one of the many services the library provides. The others said: "Now more than ever it is important to have the course so that users can use the collection better. With shrinking resources we can get by with a small collection that is well used. The sophisticated users may even save us money since they'll know what their needs are." "The credit course is even more important than I thought; some of the academic teaching faculty may even want to take it over. I don't think they should." "Formal and informal instruction in all forms have their place. The library should be sought after by users. The credit course is one of the array of services that are a part of academic research." "The course will actually relieve the reference department by making students able to use the library and teach other students at the same time." "Theoretically the course makes a cadre of students more efficient users of the library and therefore better use is made of the staff." "If the students get a good grounding in library skills, it saves us staff time in the long run." "Fiscal constraints are not relevant. The management of the library organization can structure the resources to provide for bibliographic instruction through the form of the credit course."

Most of the directors felt that separate courses in subject fields and for particular groups of users were a good thing, but recognized the practical difficulties involved. Several suggested that other units on the campus might be more appropriate avenues for this, but that the library should

provide information and cooperation as needed.

On the question of conflict or resentment arising over the credit course, most directors felt there was no more of this over the credit course than other areas in library matters. The librarians who initiated the courses have either worked things out over a given period of time, or persuaded their colleagues to join them in their enterprise, according to most of the library directors. Most agreed that from their vantage point, a teaching program cannot be developed at the expense of other things, and the normal sorting out of priorities had to occur. One director, encountering personality difficulties with several librarians over the course, asked them to list their objectives for the course: what it was, what it should do, and where it should go. This exercise provided a forum for discussion which solved the problem. From the point of view of these library directors, it seems that the credit course has not been a source of particular conflict within the context of the library.

The library directors reflected the attitudes of the other two groups previously discussed in the areas of reward, recognition, faculty interest, and the teaching role of librarians. Most of them agreed that instruction librarians received a great deal of psychic or personal satisfaction from their teaching, but little tangible reward for their efforts. Their explanations included the fact that teaching is part of the regular library program, not deserving of anything special or unusual, and that it is difficult to work within the New York state system for reward and recognition for librarians. All of the directors acknowledged that the teaching function was an important factor in the renewal, tenure, and promotion

process, and most agreed that this was one way they could reward instruction librarians. The directors were split on how they felt about their own support for the credit courses. Half felt they had given a great deal of support, both in terms of staff and materials, while the other half felt they had given moderate amounts of support in a kind of "wait and see" approach. The directors perceived that the academic faculty had shown little interest in the credit course, but that the librarians were extremely aware of the problems involved in teaching on a formal basis.

All of this group would like to see technical services librarians involved in teaching for two reasons: it gives librarians visibility as active rather than passive educators, and it will help to encourage the broadening of lines for all librarians, eliminating the traditional split between technical services and public services librarians. One or two cautioned against the work load difficulties, and felt that technical services librarians would not have time to get their work done and teach; others welcomed the chance for their technical services librarians to explore new avenues of librarianship as a possible redeployment of staff.

Probably the most interesting part of this group's responses is that question which asks for their general observations. One director said, "Librarians are finally fulfilling their mission as educators. But, they may become too much like the academic faculty and lose their freshness and flexibility." Another stated, "Symbolically, the credit course may be the only way the library can establish its claim to be an instructional unit, since the course is a form that academics can recognize. Realistically and functionally, it is only one of a variety of weapons

in the arsenal to cope with human differences in the teaching situation." Another director felt that "there is top priority to do instruction, yet we must get the books out and keep the desks manned." One director voiced concern that the librarians might become tired, "because the librarians teach day to day, the course may lose its freshness and novelty, and the students may lose interest." Evaluation was named by a director as a key issue: "The credit course is not too important from the administration's point of view; but it is of great concern to the faculty who are using the library. They know that librarians are performing a unique function, and the teaching aspect of this function is very important." Financial backing was underscored by one director: "A major problem for me is how do you fund this program along with everything else? Can you build it into the reference department along with computerized data base searching?" In sum, the library directors seem to be aware of the complexities involved in the credit course for library instruction. See Table VIII for a tabulation.

Academic Teaching Faculty.

The academic teaching faculty members evidenced few surprises in their responses to the questionnaire. See Table IX. Few of them were aware that librarians teach credit courses. All voiced concern that the credit courses be academically sound and rigorous. Many voiced sentiments that this activity would be "the wedding of teaching and research" or "provide a meaningful bridge between librarians and faculty," and "this course gives the library an added dimension and helps it to become a vital and organic part of the university." The few that were knowledgable about the library instruction credit courses on their campuses were full of praise for the course

and the librarians, and felt that the course should be required of all undergraduates.

Academic Vice Presidents.

The academic vice presidents were an interesting group to interview. Their responses reflect what I had anticipated. See Table X. In many cases they were unaware of the existence of credit courses in library instruction on their own campuses until I arrived. They seemed to feel as a group that these courses are useful and worthwhile. Nearly all of them reminisced about their own difficulties in using the library as college undergraduates or even as graduate students. All were keenly aware of how poorly prepared most of their students are in the basic skills of writing and reading. But, at the same time, they cautioned against credit courses in library instruction becoming too remedial in nature. They recognized a need for remedial work, but felt this should be done by other units on campus; library research courses should be substantive and should involve serious intellectual work. One vice president said the librarians "won a formal battle with faculty status, but they still don't have full acceptance by the teaching faculty. Anything that improves the growth and professionalism of librarians is good." Another vice president said "Librarians spend too much time worrying about their image; they should make a greater attempt to inform policy makers on campus by giving them hard data."

A few vice presidents were receptive to the idea of the library contributing to the instruction of college students. "The complexity of information and how it is structured in libraries mandates that some kind of formalized

structure be available to students. The non-credit approach doesn't work, and I am glad the library offers a credit course," is how one vice president put it. As a group the vice presidents stressed that librarians should better inform the faculty about what the library can do; this would generate the concept that the library can teach library usage in a structured fashion.

Interview Question Number	yes	no	not sure	a lot (very)	not much (somewhat)	not any (not at all)
1	24	2	4			
2	27	2	1			
3	21	4	5			
4	12	15	3			
5	24	4	2			
6				27	2	1
7				14	15	1
8				2	20	8
9				5	23	2
10				24	5	1
11	30					
12	26	4				

RESPONSES OF INSTRUCTION
LIBRARIANS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE V

Interview Question Number	yes	no	not sure	a lot (very)	not much (somewhat)	not any (not at all)
1	26		2			
2	18	7	3			
3	1[illegible]	7	6			
4	10	16	2			
5	24	4				
6				23	4	1
7				14	14	
8				5	21	2
9				6	22	
10				8	18	2
11	27	1				
12	20	3	5			

RESPONSES OF NON-TEACHING
PUBLIC SERVICES LIBRARIANS
TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE VI

Interview Question Number	yes	no	not sure	a lot (very)	not much (somewhat)	not any (not at all)
1	21	1	1			
2	14	7	2			
3	16	5	2			
4	6	16	1			
5	20	3				
6				15	8	
7			1	9	13	
8			1	3	15	4
9			2	11	10	
10	1		1	15	4	2
11	20	2	1			
12	18	5				

RESPONSES OF TECHNICAL SERVICES LIBRARIANS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE VII

Interview Question Number	yes	no	not sure	a lot (very)	not much (somewhat)	not any (not at all)
1	9	1				
2	8	2				
3	7	2	1			
4	2	6	2			
5	9	1				
6				8	2	
7				5	5	
8				2	7	1
9				3	6	1
10			1	9		
11	10					
12	10					

RESPONSES OF LIBRARY DIRECTORS
TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE VIII

Interview Question Number	yes	no	not sure	a lot (very)	not much (somewhat)	not any (not at all)
1	24					
2	17	7				
3	12	9	3			
4	2	21	1			
5	22	2				
6			1	20	3	
7			1	16	7	
8			1	2	14	7
9				5	17	2
10			2	17	3	2
11	18	4	2			
12	2	6	16			

RESPONSES OF ACADEMIC TEACHING FACULTY TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE IX

Interview Question Number	yes	no	not sure	a lot (very)	not much (somewhat)	not any (not at all)
1	8		1			
2	5	3	1			
3	8	1				
4	1	6	2			
5	9					
6				6	3	
7				4	4	1
8				1	7	1
9				3	5	1
10				6	2	1
11	8	1				
12	4		5			

RESPONSES OF VICE PRESIDENTS
TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE X

Name of Institution	Number of Instruction Librarians Interviewed	Number of Non-Teaching Public Service Librarians Interviewed	Number of Technical Services Librarians Interviewed	Library Director Interviewed	Number of Academic Teaching Faculty Interviewed	Vice President Interviewed
SUC Plattsburgh	1	3	3	1	2	1
SUNY Albany	2	7	5	1	4	1
SUC Oneonta	9	2	2	1	2	1
SUC New Paltz	5	2	2	1	3	1
SUNY ESF	3	2	1	1	1	1
SUNY Upstate Medical	3	1	1	1 (director also teaches)	1	0
SUC Oswego	1	3	2	1	2	1
SUNY Buffalo	1	4	3	1	3	1
SUNY Brockport	3	2	2	1	4	1
SUNY Stony Brook	2	2	2	1	2	1
Totals	30	28	23	10	24	9

Grand Total 124

NUMBER OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED BY CATEGORY

TABLE XI

CONCLUSION

As can be seen from the analysis of my interview data, the credit courses in library instruction on the ten SUNY campuses I visited are an integral part of the library program. The library and institutional administrations do support the credit courses. Academic faculty respond positively to librarians as teachers when they are aware of librarians teaching credit courses. Academic credit does add to the prestige of the library instruction course. Most of the librarians not involved in teaching the credit course are positive about the course and the value of librarians teaching it. Most of the credit courses in library instruction are administered through library reference departments with one or more librarians in charge of the course. Most of the credit courses include the same elements and a model course of sorts is, in effect, being used with wide variations in styles and techniques. The credit course is important to the library on most campuses, and serious consideration would be given to its elimination in times of budget cuts. Technical services librarians are involved on several campuses in teaching the course. Instruction librarians have received modest amounts of reward or recognition for their efforts. A few institutions have developed a small number of courses in special subject areas or for users with particular needs or problems, but most libraries have devoted their energy and attention to one basic course in library research. The personality of the instruction librarian is an important factor in the success of the library instruction credit course, both in terms of classroom performance and collegial support from other librarians. The dynamic forceful extrovert is not always as successful as the quieter, calmer type, especially

in relationship with other librarians.

My approach in using preliminary questionnaires, on-site interviews and observations and informal discussions for my study proved most satisfactory. There obviously are some caveats: my questions arose from my own experiences and therefore might not have been as objective as they should have been; as an instruction librarian at SUNY Albany, perhaps I was not an objective observer for my own institution, and should have had another person interview the people on this campus; I chose not to use a tape recorder since I felt this might inhibit the flow of conversation, but it meant I had to write down the responses myself; I interviewed only a small number of faculty in relation to the number of librarians and students. In spite of these conditions, I feel I got a representative response from the 124 individuals I personally interviewed, and the 250 students who returned evaluation forms. I also am convinced that on-site observations are necessary to capture the essential tone and atmosphere of the institution, as well as view the actual instruction taking place. Since, as a field, library instruction developed in libraries, particularly academic institutions, it makes sense to observe the practitioners at work with their students.

I did find my study extremely worthwhile, both personally and professionally, and I feel that I learned nearly as much about myself as I did about the credit courses in library instruction and the librarians who teach them, by having the time to think about, and reflect on, these matters. Of particular concern to me now is: What is learning?

What concepts do we really teach in our library instruction courses? What is the difference between retention and memory, or experience and remembering? Is it possible to go further than skills in our teaching? Is there a theory behind all the skills? Are skills theoretical, or can they be? Do we need to think about providing our students with a framework? Can we posit a structure to hang theoretical principles on? These are the questions that I think librarians interested in bibliographic instruction and teaching techniques should now address.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennis, W. G., *The Planning of Change.*
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Berman, Louise, *New Priorities In The Curriculum.*
Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1968.

Best, John W., *Research in Education.*
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Cook, Margaret G., *The New Library Key.*
New York: Wilson and Co., 1978.

Gates, Jean Key., *Guide To The Use of Books And Libraries.*
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.

Gattegno, C., *Common Sense of Teaching Foreign Languages.*
New York: Educational Solutions, Inc., 1977.

Gore, Daniel, *Bibliography For Beginners.*
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Hubbard, Terry and Brenda Coven and Rhonda Courtney, *Academic Research.*
Stony Brook, New York: SUNY Stony Brook, 1976.

Knapp, Patricia, *The Monteith College Library Experiment.*
New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966.

Lolley, John L., *Your Library -- What's In It For You?*
New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

Lubans, John, Jr., *Educating the Library User.*
New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1974.

Morris, Jacquelyn M., and Elizabeth A. Elkins, *Searching the Literature of the Environmental Sciences: A Strategy.*
Syracuse, New York: SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, 1976.

Piper, James, *Piper's Guide to Research.*
Encino, California: Dickenson Pub., 1972.

Rogers, Carl R., *Freedom to Learn.*
Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1969.

Smalley, Topsy N., "Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries: Questioning Some Assumptions," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 3: 280-283 (November 1977).

Turabian, Kate L., *A Manual For Writers Of Term Papers, Theses, And Dissertations.*
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Whitehead, Alfred North, *The Aims of Education.*
New York: Mentor Books, 1964.

Wilkinson, Billy R., *Reference Services For Undergraduate Students: Four Case Studies.*
Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1972.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Council on Library Resources Fellowship Grant
Proposed Program Statement of Anne Roberts 1977-1978

I would like to pursue a study of credit courses in library instruction taught by librarians in the university centers and four year colleges of SUNY during my sabbatical leave. I would like to pay on-site visits to the designated campuses and audit as many of the courses as possible in order to see how comparable these courses might be.

There has been some discussion among those of us involved in teaching courses in library skills within the State University that perhaps a standardized course or model would be useful. Librarians involved in library instruction on a national level have addressed this question at various conferences, such as the Annual Conference on Library Orientation and Instruction in Academic Libraries held at Ypsilanti, Michigan each year and in clearing houses for library instruction in numerous states.

I have collected materials and samples of credit courses and have visited several of the courses over the last few years, but timing has been a problem, since it is difficult for me to get away during the time when these courses are being taught because of my own commitments. A sabbatical leave would be the ideal time to carry out such a project. A survey of libraries in New York State that offer credit courses in library instruction has already been done by NYLIC (New York Library Instruction Clearinghouse) on whose advisory board I sit. Since the institutions have already been identified by NYLIC, I would like to observe the actual classes being taught. I anticipate that I would visit approximately twelve institutions during the six month period. I would arrange to visit those institutions situated in a particular part of the state at the same time to save on travel time and expense.

The institutions which offer library courses and that I would visit are: SUNY Buffalo, SUNY Stony Brook, SUNY Binghamton, SUC Brockport, SUC Cortland, SUC Oswego, SUC Plattsburgh, SUC New Paltz, SUC Oneonta, SUC Purchase, and SUNY Environmental Science and Forestry, and Upstate Medical.

The results of my study might show that a prototype or model library instruction course is desirable. The NYLIC Advisory Board has discussed this topic at some length, but is unsure as to how to proceed. The results of my study could easily be disseminated within the state by the NYLIC newsletter and through SUNYLA (State University of New York Librarians Association) newsletter and throughout the country via LOEX News. The implications for the library field are many, since the subject of model courses has been raised by most of the state library instruction clearinghouses.

I am interested in furthering my professional competence in this area since I now teach an undergraduate credit course in the library on library research skills. I am intriqued by the idea of developing prototypes that could be developed into generalizable models which could be applied to various types of library instruction, from basic library research techniques to more complex subject bibliographic approaches.

The well-being of the library community could be improved by this project. Most of us who are involved in library instruction are overextended and overworked. There is never time to sit back and assess or reassess our progress in library instruction. We are actively engaged in the teaching process and need the time and support to evaluate or reevaluate our efforts. If my study could determine what elements in credit courses in library instruction are comparable and generalizable for prototypes, I will have made a real contribution to the field. Not only would my findings be of value conceptually to the field, but practically as well. Most instruction librarians do not have the time to evaluate what they are doing. If I discover what the essential elements are in successful library instruction credit courses, a large step toward building a model or prototype will have been taken.

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY

August 22, 1977

Dear Colleague:

I have been awarded a Council on Library Resources Fellowship grant to do a study in the spring of 1978 of credit courses in library instruction taught by librarians within twelve SUNY units. According to the New York Library Instruction Clearinghouse, your institution offers such a course and you are named as the person in charge.

As part of my study I would like to make on-site visits to the institutions to talk with the people involved in the instruction courses and to sit in on some of the classes. Before I begin my travels, I thought it would make my visits more efficient and effective if I had some of the information to look over beforehand so that I can ask appropriate questions and not take up too much of your time.

I am enclosing a questionnaire with a stamped envelope for you to return to me. In addition to the questionnaire, could you also enclose your course syllabus and any worksheets or exercises as well as any handouts you use such as guides, bibliographies etc? Any other information that you have which you think would be helpful I would appreciate. I am enclosing a copy of my course outline, worksheets, and handouts.

I look forward to hearing from you and beginning my study.

Sincerely yours,

Anne Roberts
Associate Librarian

AR:cd
Encl.

CLR Fellowship Grant of Anne Roberts
on
Library Instruction, 1977-1978

Master Questionnaire on credit courses in library instruction.

1. Name of course: _____
   _____

2. Is course taught for academic credit: _____
   How many: _____

3. Is course graded: _____
   Letter_____ Pass/Fail _____

4. Frequency of course:
   Semester _____
   Annual _____
   Other (specify) _____
   _____
   How long has course been taught:
   2 years or less _____
   3 - 5 years _____
   6 - 10 years _____

5. Number of students taking course:
   Semester _____
   Annual _____
   Other (specify) _____
   Total number of students taking course: _____

6. Person in charge of course:
   Name _____
   Title _____
   Position _____
   Other librarians involved in course:
   Number _____
   Departments _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

7. Authority of course:
   Academic department (specify) _____
   _____
   _____
   Library _____
   _____
   Administrator responsible:
   Name _____
   Title _____
   Position _____

8. To what extent do the objectives of the course coincide with the objectives of the library and the institution:
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

9. How frequently do you test:
   Pre-test _____
   Post-test _____
   During course _____
   Other (specify) _____

10. Evaluation of course:
    Pre-test, post-test _____
    Evaluation forms _____
    Other (specify) _____

11. To what extent do you evaluate your course for your stated objectives? _____
    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

8-18-77
AR:cd

CLR Fellowship Grant of Anne Roberts
on
Library Instruction, 1977-1978

Biographical information for librarians involved in teaching the course.

1. Sex: Male _____ Female _____

2. Age: Under 30 _____
40 - 49 _____
50 - 59 _____
60 - 69 _____
30 - 40 _____

3. Years of experience in library-instruction:
2 years or less _____
3 - 5 years _____
6 - 10 years _____
10 - 15 years _____

4. Educational background:
College graduate _____
(Subject) Graduate degree _____
(MLS) Professional degree _____
(other) Graduate work _____
(please specify) _____

5. Present position: _____
_____

6. Title: _____
_____

7. Areas of specialization: _____
_____
_____

8. Interests and hobbies: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

9. Professional organizations you belong to. Please identify:
_____
_____
_____
_____

10. Professional journals you subscribe to. Please list:

_____
_____
_____
_____

11. What do you feel was most important in preparing you for library instruction? _____

_____
_____
_____
_____

12. What do you feel was most lacking in preparing you for library instruction? _____

_____
_____
_____
_____

13. What would you like to change about the library instruction course? _____

_____
_____
_____
_____

14. Where do you think the library instruction course will be in the next five years? _____

_____
_____
_____
_____

8-18-77
AR:cd

APPENDIX C

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY

December 7, 1977

Dear Colleague:

I am trying to firm up my sabbatical plans and wondered if the dates February 20th and 21st, Monday and Tuesday, would be a convenient time for me to visit you. I would like to do the following: (a) sit in on as many sections of the library instruction credit course as possible; (b) meet with the librarians who are teaching the course; (c) meet with the person in charge of the course; (d) meet with some librarians not involved with the course; (e) meet with academic faculty; (f) meet with the library director; (g) meet with the academic administrator of the library, usually the vice-president. I estimate that I would interview about twelve people altogether, so that can give you an idea of the numbers I had in mind.

Please let me know if these dates would be convenient for you. Thank you very much for your help and cooperation in arranging for my meeting schedule and visit. I am enclosing a copy of my program statement for you. I look forward to visiting you.

Sincerely yours,

Anne Roberts
Associate Librarian

AR:cd
Encl.

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions
CLR Fellowship of Anne Roberts 1977-78

1. Given the fiscal constraints that colleges and universities are facing today, do you think that credit courses in library instruction should continue to be given. Can the library function to meet the teaching demands placed on it in this way?

2. Do you think library instruction courses should be offered in special subject areas such as the humanities, social sciences, or sciences? If so, how do you think this could best be done: by the academic teaching faculty member, by the librarian, by the faculty and librarian team-teaching?

3. Do you think library instruction courses should be offered for students with the following special problems or needs; the educationally or emotionally handicapped, those with a language barrier, the physically handicapped, the older returning student, the professional community citizen?

4. Has there been any conflict or friction between people in the library that you are aware of over the credit course, such as course content, scheduling problems, released time for preparation, jealousy, resentment, or frustration? If you have experienced any problems, and you have solved them, how have you done so?

5. Do you think the course should be offered evenings or weekends if there is a student need or demand for it then?

6. How important do you feel the credit course in library instruction is to the library?

7. How much support, and/or recognition do you feel the librarians have received for their efforts in the credit course?

8. How much reward have librarians received, or not, for their involvement with the course?

9. How much interest has the academic teaching faculty shown in the librarians role as teaching faculty?

10. Has teaching made the librarians more sympathetic and understanding about the concerns of the academic faculty?

11. Is there a particular type of student that you feel benefits from the course?

12. How do you feel about technical services librarians teaching the course?

13. What observations, if any, have you made about credit courses in library instruction? Do you have any insights that I might find useful in the pursuit of this study that you would care to share with me?

APPENDIX E

Teaching Performance Checklist
CLR Fellowship of Anne Roberts 1977-1978

1. Is the librarian formal? informal?
2. How does the librarian use eye contact? body language? body movement? clothes?
3. Does the librarian ask questions in defining terms or giving explanations? Or wait for questions?
4. Does the librarian "lecture" or encourage dialogue? both? how? elaborate?
5. What use are made of visual aids? blackboard? posters? slides? handouts? overhead projectors? other? how are they used?
6. What is the room arrangement? formal? informal?
7. Attitude of class: resigned, attentive, enthusiastic, bored, accepting, hostile, other.
8. What techniques does the librarian use to teach? describe or list.
9. Is the personality evident in librarian's presentation? tone? style?
10. What level is the librarian aiming for? does the librarian try to reach everyone? the upper? the middle? the lower?
11. Does the librarian call the students by their first name or last name?
12. How much control (power) does the librarian hold over the class?
13. To what extent does the librarian differentiate between theory and practice? illustrations? concrete examples?

APPENDIX F

CLR Fellowship of Anne Roberts 1977-1978
Institutions Visited Within SUNY

SUC Plattsburgh	January 18, 19
SUNY Albany	January 30, 31
SUC Oneonta	February 1, 2
SUC New Paltz	February 8, 9
SUNY Environmental Science and Forestry	February 13
SUNY Upstate Medical	February 14
SUC Oswego	February 15, 16
SUNY Buffalo	February 20, 21
SUC Brockport	February 22, 23
SUNY Stony Brook	March 1, 2

APPENDIX G

Student Evaluation Form
for CLR Fellowship

Undergrad_____ Grad_____ Other_____ Specify

What did you like best about the course?

_____

_____

_____

What did you like least about the course?

_____

_____

_____

Was the course:	too long	_____
	too short	_____
	just right	_____
Was the information presented:	too much	_____
	too little	_____
	just right	_____
Was the information presented clearly:	yes	_____
	no	_____
Was the lecture content useful:	yes	_____
	no	_____
Were the worksheets helpful:	yes	_____
	no	_____
Were the slide/tapes useful:	yes	_____
	no	_____

What was most helpful to you?

_____

_____

_____

What was least helpful to you?

_____

_____

_____

Can you make suggestions to improve the course?

_____

_____

_____

What would you have liked covered that wasn't?

_____

_____

_____

Additional comments:

_____

_____

_____